



# Career barriers for women executives and the Glass Ceiling Syndrome: the case study comparison between French and Turkish women executives.

Cansu Akpinar

## ► To cite this version:

Cansu Akpinar. Career barriers for women executives and the Glass Ceiling Syndrome: the case study comparison between French and Turkish women executives.. 2nd International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management, Oct 2012, Istanbul, Turkey. pp.11. halshs-00738519

**HAL Id: halshs-00738519**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00738519>**

Submitted on 26 Oct 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**Career barriers for women executives and the Glass Ceiling Syndrome: the case study comparison between French and Turkish women executives.**

Cansu Akpinar-Sposito

Octobre – 2012

2nd International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management

Career barriers for women executives and the Glass Ceiling Syndrome: the case  
study comparison between French and Turkish women executives.

Cansu Akpinar-Sposito\*

Ecole Doctorale Sciences Economiques et de Gestion

Doctoral School of Economics and Management

Jean Moulin University Lyon 3, Lyon, 69008 France

---

**Abstract**

The situation where gender pay gaps are typically wider at the top of the wage distribution is known as the ‘glass ceiling’. It is one of the most compelling metaphors recently used for analyzing inequality between men and women in the workplace, in order to describe a barrier to further advancement once women have attained a certain level. The general-case glass ceiling hypothesis states that not only is it more difficult for women than for men to be promoted up levels of authority hierarchies within workplaces but also that the obstacles women face relative to men become greater as they move up the hierarchy.

This study presents an overview of glass-ceiling type barriers in organizations based on the perceptions of a sample of French and Turkish mid-level women managers. This study investigates how women in middle management perceive their career advancement opportunities and what they consider their organizations to be doing to support their advancement. This study begins with an introduction of the concept of a glass ceiling that prevents women from advancing, and then continues with previous studies on corporate practices and data analysis of samples from French and Turkish organizations. The objective of this work is to summarize the Glass Ceiling Phenomenon and make a comparison of different arguments of researchers. In particular with this study, It has been pointed out that most past research has been relied on indirect tests which fail to distinguish studies of the glass ceiling effect who have investigated a variety of labour market outcomes such as promotions (Powell and Butterfield 1994, Yap and Konrad(2009)), women carrier (Belgihiti Kartochian, Laufer(2004)), inequality (David J. Maume Jr.) and sex segregation (Mia Hultin 2003).

*Keywords:* Glass Ceiling, Carrier Barriers, Women in Leadership

---

© 2012 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Leadership, Technology and Innovation Management

\*Corresponding author. Tel. + 336 03 98 34 09

E-mail address: cansu.akpinar3@univ-lyon3.fr

## 1. Introduction

In today's world, more women than ever are entering the labour force but the majority of top management positions in almost all countries are primarily held by men. Female managers generally tend to be concentrated in lower management positions and have less authority than men. And in the same time women are still concentrated in traditionally "female" functional areas of companies such as; human resources, corporate communications, community and governmental relations marketing and finance (Catalyst, 1991; U.S. Department of Labor, 1991). Although women as a whole may place less emphasis on career success than men, there are a considerable number of women who strive for top management positions and are unable to attain them.

"Women at work" has been an important topic of conversation and organizational strategy for 100 years, and certainly in the last two or three decades. There has been several strategies show that US corporations have decided to improve the work experience of women. This strategy has focused on breaking through the glass ceiling. The situation where gender pay gaps are typically wider at the top of the wage distribution is known as the 'glass ceiling'. It is one of the most compelling metaphors recently used for analyzing inequality between men and women in the workplace, in order to describe a barrier to further advancement once women have attained a certain level. "The glass ceiling argument suggests that gender and race differentials are largest at higher organizational levels" Yap and Konrad (2009)

The objective of this work is to summarize the Glass Ceiling Phenomenon and make a comparison of different arguments of researchers. In particular with this study, It has been pointed out that most past research has been relied on the glass ceiling effect who have investigated a variety of labour market outcomes such as promotions (Powell and Butterfield 1994, Yap and Konrad(2009)), women carrier (Belgihiti Kartochian, Laufer(2004)), inequality (David J. Maume Jr.) and sex segregation (Mia Hultin 2003). This work is divided into four parts. The first part offers a presentation of the definitions of Glass ceiling. The second part refers a synthesis of the promotion effect in the labor market. The third part presents the most common measures of chose of the women and work/family decision. Finally, the last part provides an overview of the overall situation in Europe and the sector and activity. It presents cross-country comparisons for glass ceiling on the labor market.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. General Definition of Glass Ceiling

The glass ceiling is a term which symbolizes a variety of barriers faced by women and by minorities as they seek to improve their employment status. Many studies confirmed the glass ceiling hypothesis and indicated that women in their early lives experienced a number of barriers during their decision of their career path (Phillips & Imhoff, 1997); and also invisible barriers, which continued to prevent women from moving up to a higher position in organizations (Adair, 1999; Baxter & Wright, 2000; Lyness & Thompson, 2000). Lyness and Thompson (2000) were curious about whether women and men executives followed similar routes in climbing the corporate ladder. In fact they found that women face greater barriers and they need different strategies to succeed than do men. In order to be a successful executive, women have to overcome isolation, sex-stereotyping and performance pressures.

Moreover, the term "Glass ceiling" was coined in a 1986 issue of The Wall Street Journal on corporate women by Hymowitz and Schellhardt. The glass ceiling is a concept that most frequently refers to barriers faced by women who attempt, to attain senior positions (as well as higher salary levels) in corporations, government, education and non-profit organizations. Just five years after in 1991, as part of the Civil Rights Act, a Glass Ceiling Commission was appointed by the executive branch and chaired by the Secretary of Labour\*. This 21-member group was established to discover blockages and broaden career possibilities and progression options for women and minorities (The Glass Ceiling Commission, 2003). To target these obstructions the commission members agreed on a common definition would help them identify the barriers. They agreed the glass ceiling was melded from, "invisible, artificial barriers that prevent qualified individuals from advancing within their organization and reaching full potential" (2003).

\*The United States Secretary of Labour is the head of the Department of Labour who exercises control over the department and enforces and suggests laws involving unions, the workplace, and all other issues involving any form of business-person controversies.

The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission\* described three classes of barriers for women and people of colour in top level management. The first class of barriers is *Societal Barriers* describe the availability and quantity of educated women and people of colour for particular positions and the differences that can be attributed to different groups of individuals as they relate to desired leadership characteristics. The second class of barriers is *Internal Structural Barriers*. These barriers include a lack of outreach efforts on behalf of businesses to underrepresented populations, corporate climates that may not be tolerant of difference and pipeline barriers which include a resistance to training and mentoring members of underrepresented groups for future promotions. The third class of barriers is described as *Government Barriers*. These barriers include a lack of monitoring and law enforcement on behalf of the government, weaknesses in data collection for descriptive analyses, and discussion and inadequate reporting on the existence of a glass ceiling.

Cotter and colleagues (2001), they examine three remaining criteria for discerning the effects of a glass ceiling (2001). *First*, a glass ceiling exists when artificial barriers impede the advancement of women and minorities. In measuring discrimination, analysts often control for education, work experience, tenure with the current employer, and familial factors affecting productivity (e.g., marital /parental status). *A second* criterion for investigating the concept of a glass ceiling is that one must use longitudinal data to examine job transitions over time. *A third* criterion for the existence of a glass ceiling is that inequality grows over the life course; this implies that the barriers to mobility existing early in a career become more severe later in the career.

Yet in addition, a glass ceiling is often invoked to explain disparate treatment of women and minorities in lower-level and blue-collar jobs. Cotter and colleagues (2001) contended that the glass-ceiling concept is increasingly equated with generic forms of racial and gender inequality, and is losing its power to describe a unique form of inequality at the apex of organizations. They conceded the point that immobility can occur in all occupations, but contended that if job limits are the same at all levels of the occupational hierarchy, and then one is describing racial or gender inequality, not a glass ceiling.

The glass ceiling exists when discrimination increases in severity with movement up the occupational hierarchy. This time, Cotter and colleagues define four specific criteria that must be met to conclude that a glass ceiling exists in a workplace:

1. "A gender or racial difference that is not explained by other job-relevant characteristics of the employee."
2. "A gender or racial difference that is greater at higher levels of an outcome than at lower levels of an outcome."
3. "A gender or racial inequality in the chances of advancement into higher levels, not merely the proportions of each gender or race currently at those higher levels."
4. "A gender or racial inequality that increases over the course of a career."

They find evidence of a glass ceiling for women, but racial inequalities among men do not follow a similar pattern. Thus, we should not describe all systems of differential work rewards as "glass ceilings." They appear to be a distinctively gender phenomenon. The popular notion of glass ceiling effects implies that gender disadvantages are stronger at the top of the hierarchy than at lower levels and that these disadvantages become worse later in a person's career.

On the other hand, the glass ceiling is a controversial subject that is constantly in hot pursuit. There are many statistics and theories that come into play; so many, in fact, that people may find it difficult to reach a solid conclusion. Morrison and colleagues (1991) described the glass ceiling as a transparent barrier that keeps women from rising above a certain level in corporations. They even considered it a barrier for women as a group, barring individuals' advancement simply because they are women rather than because they lack the ability to handle jobs at higher levels. Belgihiti and Kartochian (2008) support with an idea which explains that "women have some barriers when they reach a level where they become executive: in the same time men have the same barriers as well, but the question is that women have more than twice as many barriers than men at the same level".

For Powell and Butterfield (2003), "glass ceiling could exist at different levels in different organizations or industries; the term is typically used to suggest a barrier to entry into top-level management positions. No field studies to date have investigated whether actual promotion decisions for top management positions reflect the glass ceiling

phenomenon.” From the other side Jaqueline Laufer (2004); «The glass ceiling phenomenon is that a strategy of the women and the strategy of the challenge».

In summary, all these ideas show that glass ceiling is visible and invisible obstacle which separates the professional and organisational hierarchical level for women. In particular, women who believe that glass ceiling phenomenon will operate to their disadvantage may be less likely to apply for open positions than equally qualified men. However, a smaller number of female applicants may also lead to a smaller number of promotions of women to top management positions. Thus, to truly avert the glass ceiling phenomenon, organizations need to address perceptions about how promotion decisions are made as well as the reality.

## 2.2 *Promotion Effect*

Some evidence suggests that gender and race effects on promotion are more prevalent in some parts of the organizational hierarchy than in others. To illustrate, Powell and Butterfield (1994) found that for promotions to the highest organizational levels, women experienced an advantage over equivalent male counterparts and they add that in the same organization, race had no impact, either positive or negative, on promotions at the highest organizational levels. Other evidence suggests that women experience large promotion disadvantages in occupations that are located at the lowest organizational levels (Bihagen and Ohls, 2006; Pekkarinen and Vartiainen, 2006).

Most studies of decisions about management positions have focused on selection rather than promotion decisions (Hitt & Barr, 1989) or have examined criteria for decisions made about hypothetical rather than real applicants. Indeed, Lyness and Heilman (2006) found to the same level. Findings that race discrimination is attenuated (Powell and Butterfield, 1997), and that women have a promotion advantage at the tops of large organizations support the notion that in order to be seriously considered for top management positions, women and members of racial minority groups must be extremely well-qualified for promotion. Individuals who move quickly up the middle management ranks are the most likely to eventually attain senior management positions (Hurley and Sonnenfeld, 1998). In the research of Powell and Butterfield (1994), they have proposed that the applicant gender may have both direct and indirect effects on promotion decisions. In addition, the gender of decision makers may have a moderating effect on the relationship between applicant gender and promotion decisions for top management positions.

Stumpf and London (1981) identified the criteria, on how actual promotion decisions are made for top management positions, which are commonly used when decisions are made about management promotions. They specified both job-irrelevant criteria, such as gender, race, and appearance, and job-relevant criteria, such as related work experience, being a current member of the organization offering the position, past performance, education, and seniority.

According to Yap and Konrad (2009), promotions are linked to so many important outputs, gender and race effects on promotion outcomes that mention differential access to an important source of resources, benefits and satisfaction. Gender discrimination may have been directly influenced by past personnel decisions about women, making it more difficult for them than for men to obtain the necessary preparation for top management positions. Also, there could be gender differences in the distribution of job market skills such as education and work experience. Women consistently report to have lower salaries and lower levels of satisfaction than their male colleagues, and in academia they are less likely to be tenured or on the tenure track. Although respondents from both sexes respond positively to their work, indicating that it is intellectually challenging and provide a desirable level of autonomy in decision making, women report fewer opportunities for promotion and indicate more often than men that they would not recommend their career path to younger students.

As can be imagined that good performance ratings usually increase the chance of promotion or career advancement. A low proportion of women at the highest level of company resulted in a business women's higher intent of leaving and reduced their satisfaction at work (Burke et McKeen 1996). This means that they don't see themselves to become executive women in the future explains Bender (2001). A woman manager may be demotivated by the lack of promotion prospects and would be less involved (Belghiti and Kartochian 2008). However, promotions result in increased job satisfaction, opportunities to do more complex work, and greater ability to exercise authority, many employees' value promotions (Pekkarinen and Vartiainen, 2006, Hultin, 2003). But “To have good promotions, women need to have a strong human capital background, Given that women are more tied to a specific geographic location for family reasons than men are” says Bielby and Bielby (1992) and that employers might prefer men over women due to actual or perceived supervisor, co-worker, or client discrimination adds Hultin (2003), men are likely to

have more outside offers, which results in increases in their pay. This argument implies that gender and race do not necessarily affect the probability of promotion itself.

Human capital theory is the investment of the educational background and the job experiences. Women who anticipate a career interruption due to maternity would invest less in education and formation (Mincer and Polacheck, 1974). They accumulate less human capital than men which could prevent them from having access to occupations up the professional hierarchy. Human capital theory is in this sense no longer powerful given that women have caught up with men and even surpassed them in terms of educational attainments. Becker (1971) suggests that workers make rational choices regarding investment in their own education and careers. If women create less human capital over time than men, then their career development, including ascendancy to top management positions, would be more restricted (Stroh et al., 1992). Finally, “gender discrimination may have influenced prior evaluations of employees' human capital, with women given less credit for their education, work experience, and so on than men” says Powell and Butterfield (1994).

Based on the human capital theory, not only the general gender-specific pay differentials, but also the different proportions of women and men in certain occupations and fields of work and thus the gender-specific labor market segregation is explained with the so-called self-selection (Polachek 1981). The gender-specific occupational choice is also a result of a rational cost-utility calculation; women choose in particular jobs that can be combined with family responsibilities, for example, those that allow part-time work and breaks in employment and those with a low obsolescence risk. The different level of integration into the labor market can, in accordance with this approach of self-selection, explain gender-specific career mobility to a large extent.

In summary, in this part, it has been argued that the existence of a glass ceiling should be applied to the analysis of managerial attainment. Granting control over the firm's human and fiscal resources is an important symbolic display of trust in the worker. As Maume (1999) explains that “If firms are more willing to promote men to managerial status than women and minorities, then a significant mechanism by which inequality is created and sustained has been identified. This can be called a glass ceiling if racial and gender inequality is observed after controlling for productivity-relevant factors, and inequality grows over the course of a person's career”.

### *2.3 Women in workplace: Work and family balance*

Work and life balance challenges can impact women's advancement and, if not dealt with, may contribute to the glass-ceiling phenomenon. Women are typically the primary family caregivers for children and/or the elderly. Assumptions are often made regarding women's availability to do a job without interference from family responsibilities. Further, some organizations may not offer work/life programs that support outside commitments, particularly for senior-level positions. As a possible solution, perhaps, women could choose to work fewer hours than men in order to spend more time with their families. Women also measure success in the workplace differently than men. Men tend to measure success by high salaries and important job titles whereas women place a higher value on their relationships with colleagues and community service. Therefore, many women are at a disadvantage to take steps that would increase the likelihood of advancing up the corporate ladder.

Having children brings a lot of responsibilities to a family life and this is the reason why many women decide to leave their careers prematurely so as to raise their children sufficiently. For this reason, employers occasionally hesitate to promote women because they are afraid that women will choose their families first. Nonetheless, an increasing number of companies are realizing the fact that women need some time out and have undertaken attempts to encourage women to remain longer in their careers as the participation of women is vital to the diversity and to the successes of corporations (George, 2005)

Laufer (2003) indicates that the ‘different needs’ of women lead them to create a self-imposed glass ceiling, in this manner only artificially seeming as if a glass ceiling would block their careers. Confronted with the ever-present glass ceiling, it is no longer possible, as has often been the case, to talk of the “choice of women for family” in explaining the absence of women in applying for certain vacancies, whilst at present many women uphold both a successful career and children. It is therefore necessary to “shift the focus” so as to give more weight to the organizational obstacles outlined here.

Many women who are at senior management positions seem to be not quite willing to climb for upper management positions because they cannot take the risk of bringing political conflicts, polemics and ambition into their family lives. Additionally, women often do not see their own personal skills and talent sufficient for those kinds of roles. However, the idea that women are not interested in high hierarchical positions because of the difficulty of reconciliation is increasingly challenged. Thus, the 2004 Catalyst study, “corporate leadership: same workplace, different realities” shows that women executives who aim at reaching the CEO position are as much as men and women with children at home desire it even more (55% against 46%).

Finally, the realization of organizational work-family initiatives is perceived to pave the way for women to make it to the top. Especially as programs such as child care support services, maternity leave arrangements or part-time working enables women to balance their family needs without sacrificing work (Straub, 2007). Powell (1999) mentioned that the “typical executive job has enormous responsibilities, time demands and pressures, which eventually calls for considerable sacrifices in personal life”. As a consequence, women are often less willing than men to make such substantial sacrifices as many want to have children, spent time with family or simply do not want such a huge responsibility in their daily work.

A French research into young female executives has led to the observation of just how many of them prepare, at around their 30's, for the future limitations imposed by family life. Mainiero and Sullivan (2006) have studied the phenomenon of opting out that woman executive who leaves the companies massively after their 35's – 40's. Their reason to leave did not differ significantly from those of men, except with respect to the time to spend with their families.

Deemer and Fredericks (1999) retain that there are 4 mental behaviors which block the career progress of women managers and these are: a sense of victimization, limiting personal convictions, single-mindedness, paying attention to the status quo. Research shows that in societies where gender based roles are imposed, a working women perceives her in a different position than men. Initially, since being a wife and mother is prior for women they choose not to travel and work for long hours which affect their career progress. Laufer (2004) explains that some professional women give up the opportunities because of travel involved in their jobs.

Basically, for all sectors; travelling could be a real barrier for women who would like to become an executive. One of the requirements for advancement in many corporations is the mobility of the executives. Women, according to the glass ceiling commission's report (1991), are assumed by their superiors not to be willing to relocate, thus hindering their career advancement. This phenomenon was verified by a study, quoted in the report, done by the Kellogg Graduated School of Management and Loyola university, of the career progressions of male and female managers with similar education, positions, ability to relocate, and career orientation. The study showed that the females had been transferred less often than their male colleagues, resulting in slower advancement and income. The study calls this practice discriminatory. It is true that many women managers would choose not to relocate, if asked to, because of their children's education and social support systems.

In general, women are less available for geographic mobility and are mostly "followers" of their spouse (Pochic, 2005). On the research of Bender and Pigeyre (2008), they mentioned the Dual career. Dual career households therefore impact on traditional family roles; the problem of such households is a female problem, however, as women have greater difficulty in making their husbands and partners accept any professional mobility. It is typically the woman who has to interrupt her career to follow the male (Laufer and Pigeyre, 2000). To meet (to satisfy) the educational needs of children, dual-career couples can develop different carrier strategies: differentiation or division of roles, sequentially or simultaneously say Sekaran and Hall, 1989.

In the other side, Merignac and Falcoz, (2000) have proposed that the acceptance or not of mobility by the partner can be influenced by the support proposed by the company. If there is a dual career situation, for the double career couple, the mobilization of men can be a problem for his conjoint. Before men accept to move to another country, the company, who proposes a high level of job for men, needs to look for a job for his conditions. It will be the responsibility of the company or, otherwise, it will become a big decision for the couple who will make a decision for their future. For a professional couple with dual career, juggling work and home responsibilities has never been easy. However, in today's global economy, where local job opportunities may be harder to find, new challenges are emerging. May be, it is possible to have a successful career without sacrificing personal satisfaction, life balance, or relationships.



Finally, opportunities for promotion often favor men due to developmental prospects, such as mentoring and networks. Women may not have full access to informal networks men use to develop work relationships in the company, and these networks often tend to exclude women due to the nature of their activities or the perception that these are "male activities", thus contributing to gender barriers in the workplace.

#### *2.4 Sector and activity- (Organizational Influences)*

Many other researchers have been interested in the magnitude and determinants of racial and gender inequality in the labor market. In 1990s, the concept of a glass ceiling pervaded the literature to describe the paucity of women and minorities heading public and private sector organizations. Several small-scale studies conducted at different times point to the scarcity of top women managers in the private sector. Studies conducted in last five decades show that the ratio of women employed in executive positions in the private sector does not surpass 4% and that there has been no increase in their representation levels in the past 30 years in the manufacturing sector. Even in sectors like banking or insurance, that traditionally employs high numbers of women; the percent of top women managers is close to 3% or 4%. There is a sharp decrease in women's presence as the position gets to be more strategic and involves decision-making responsibility for large groups of people and significant amount of resources.

Bender and Pigeys (2008) explain that in public sector, supposedly more equal; women additionally struggle to occupy all posts and to reach the highest hierarchical level. In three of the public sector employment areas (State, local authorities, hospital), women are concentrated in the lower qualified positions. There is also a large degree of segmentation in terms of careers. At university, for instance, whilst there appears to be a large degree of parity in senior lecturer posts, women only represent 15% of professors, across all disciplines. In France : in the case of the disciplines studied, the rate of passage of women Assistant professor (maître-assistant) to the rank of Professor, is not related to their numbers in the category and remains lower than men of the numbers involved says Laufer (2004).

As demonstrated here, the growth in the number of female graduates and those occupying executive posts, which stands at a high proportion in many countries, has not been followed by proportional increase in females in such posts in higher education (senior management position). This degree of segmentation which can additionally be observed in French universities: in the case of those disciplines which form the focus of this study, the rate of moving from assistant lecturers to professors is not linked to their total representation across the entire sector and remains much lower than that of males, irrespective of the number of employees concerned.

The research performed by Bagues & Esteve-Volart (2007) found an extremely low percentage of women in supervisory and management positions, at both the private and public sector. For instance, in Italy and France, 3% and 4% respectively, of the 50 largest companies' board directors are women. In the US, women only made up 3, 4% of the top level management back in 1997. Finally, in Europe, none of the 25 highest earning CEOs are female (Emerald, 2006). These numbers already indicate that women are faced with treatment discrimination in terms of promotion possibilities, especially likely to occur into management and further extending to pay disparities between men and women across occupational categories.

Cultural and social attitudes towards what constitutes "male" or "female" jobs result in occupational segregation, although the extent of the problem varies from country to country and from job to job. It is important to keep in mind that there are important institutional differences between countries regarding their educational and academic systems. This makes comparisons difficult. In United States, according to Adams study (2007), women, for instance, held less than 16 percent of the corporate officer positions in the United States (US) Fortune 500 companies in 2002 and less than 15 percent of Canada's FP500 corporate officer positions in 2004. Females also represented less than 2 percent of all Chief Executive Officer (CEO) positions at major US corporations in 2004. Similar to this result, Stuart's (2008) research indicated that there were only fourteen females in the CEO position at firms in the S&P 500. Catalyst released some interesting statistics about women in business in the United States. The research shows that:

- Percentage of women in the U.S. labor force: 46.3%
- Percentage of women in management, professional and related occupations: 50.6%
- Percentage of female Fortune 500 corporate officers: 15.4%
- Percentage of female Fortune 500 board seats: 14.8%
- Percentage of female Fortune 500 top earners: 6.7%
- Percentage of female Fortune 500 CEOs: 2.4%

In France, the majority of the women executives in the companies, in the public sectors, in the universities, au CNRS will be marked. Thereby, there are just: 7% of women, who work as an executive, 31% are in administration and commercial, 12, 5 % work in function public and 49% are in state. In French universities, there is totally 16% among professor and 38% of senior lecturer posts. For instance, in Italy and France, 3% and 4% respectively, of the 50 largest companies' board of directors are women. In the US, women only made up 3, 4% of the top level management back in 1997. In Europe, none of the 25 highest earning CEOs are female (Emerald, 2006). The number of the population is 46% women,) 30 % of women work on sector of education, health and action social (INSEE\* Enquête Emploi 2003

In Turkey, the glass ceiling exists in all sectors as with all around the world, including the public and private sectors as well as nongovernmental organizations. Women – 52% of the 70 million populations – earn 40% less than men and provide just a quarter of the registered labour force, while 42% of them work unpaid for their families – mainly in the fields. They hold just 4% of seats in the Ankara parliament. Of the 550 members in the Turkish Parliament, 48 are women. In the financial sector alone the percentage of women working in the top jobs is higher than in France. Turkish women are underrepresented in managerial positions like in all countries. The problem is not lost on many of the high-ranking women executives in Turkey, where 12 percent of chief executive positions are held by women, about the same as in Germany according to the World Economic Forum. Furthermore, women's representation in management positions falls sharply at the upper echelons of the hierarchy. Studies conducted by H. Kabasakal (2004), most executive women in Turkey are married and have either one or two children. Several studies conducted in western societies show that given the immense household demands on married women, most women feel the need to make a choice between their careers and private life. On the other hand, the availability of low-paid maids in Turkey allows women managers to delegate the housework and child-rearing responsibilities to the fulltime employed maids.

The other point of view explained by Laufer (1999) is that women are mainly concentrated in the “feminized” professions such as nursing and teaching, where at the same time they remain in lower job categories than men. However, women continue to make small inroads into non-traditional fields such as law, information and communication technology and computer science, engineering, so there is evidence that employers are beginning to promote women more systematically and to introduce family-friendly policies in order to retain them. Additionally, they are also less presented for the sector of Industry and Construction. Pigeyre and Bender (2008) describe that women choose more and more the juridical sector; the number of lawyer women in 1992 was 32%, in 2002 it was 52%. And they add; “Women work often some certain jobs as communication 70%, function personnel 62%, finance and accountable 47% , commerce and sales 11%.

Belgihiti and Kartochain (2008) explain that for the sector of engineering, women with a good level of certificate, after graduating from the best schools, have more unemployment problem than men have. This sentence proposes an idea; the glass ceiling can be have high probability in the engineering sectors or it depends of the personality or “the look” of the employer. But in the other side, this observation actually brings a further issue to light. An interesting question is asked by Pigeyre and Bender (2008); why men often have science bachelor degrees twice more than women while they come from a same technological background? A survey conducted amongst 15-25 year olds on their opinions concerning sciences confirms that females are less likely to study science than their male counterparts and that they are much more successful than boys. Girls stated that they find science boring and they prefer humanities than pure sciences (Pigeyre and Bender, 2008).

Of course, other factors are also likely to be at work. Many labor markets are hierarchical, and promotions and appointments procedures can exacerbate gender pay gaps across the pay distribution. While promotions are typically subject to well-defined procedures, especially in larger organizations, exactly where in the rank-specific salary scale a successful candidate is appointed can depend on individual negotiation skills or employer discretion, in addition to experience. After all the statistics are stripped away, though, one naked truth persists: Women are just as capable as men. "Great ideas have no gender, race, ethnic background or age," DiRusso says. Women may have to work a little harder to reach the top, but it can and does happen. In the not-so-distant future, with a little extra effort on everyone's part, more women could be buttoning up their suits and heading into that corner office.

\*The INSEE code is a numerical indexing code used by the French National Institute for Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) to identify various entities, including communes, departments.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Research Goal

This review takes a well-documented concept, the “glass ceiling” and seeks to enrich our scholarly understanding of the term by analyzing the historical context, the contemporaneous uses of the term, and the ways in which this term has infiltrated research literature. By comparing and contrasting the work from multiple areas and culture (all grounded in the belief that they are discussing glass ceiling effects), we hope to aid in building a scholarly consensus on what a glass ceiling is and how it operates.

This paper is an exploratory study. The research will be focused on mid-level women managers in French and Turkish organizations and the samples will be selected from similar or same sector and same industry in France and Turkey. This approach seems particularly well suited to women in leadership and management. In this project, I will explore how the women become a leader with their social and cultural influences (e.g., organizational culture, national/ethnic culture, and gender). In particular, I will focus on the glass ceiling and what kind of barriers they can have when they climb the steps? Why do so few women become business leaders? Also, the study will test the usefulness of a perspective (the situational approach) that is underdeveloped in the leadership literature. This has been broken into the following sub-objectives:

- Can women who live in a developing country have the same possibility to become a leader then women live in a developed country?
- Are the possibilities of the life style in a country, where he/she comes from, can make the way easier to become a leader?
- How they break the glass ceiling to be in an executive suite?

#### 3.2 Methods

1. Data collection: Conduct a literature review on leadership and management. Data collection will comprise documents (school magazines, bulletins, newsletters, policy statements, prospectuses and more informal artefacts...etc.) and responses in interviews. There were approx. 45 documents that met the criteria for inclusion at the time of this review. A two stage process resulted in this sample for review. First, some electronic databases were used to conduct searches as such ERIC database, RDS Contemporary Women's Issues, Academic Search/EBSCO...etc. These databases were searched using the following terms: (a) glass ceiling and (b) glass ceiling effect(s), (c) carriers barriers for women, (d) women in business. Second, abstracts were printed and screened by the researchers using the required inclusion criteria (i.e., document used glass ceiling to describe some form of workplace discrimination). At this stage, we were only concerned with documents that actually used the term glass ceiling

2. Interviews and questionnaires: All the interviews will be conducted over a 3 years period, during which the researcher will make repeated visits to the companies, to the homes of interviewees in the metropolitan and country areas. I will make depth interviews with the mid-level women managers (Women Executives) in France and in Turkey.

3. Write a research report: that combines my understanding of the relevant theory and previous research with the results of my empirical research.

### 4. Conclusion

In today's modern world, it is known that a glass ceiling exists for women in management and it is being studied and remedied from varying perspectives. A few women have moved beyond the glass ceiling into the executive suite, yet their number is not proportionate to their representation at middle management levels and is far below that of their similarly qualified male counterparts. Both domestically and globally, women represent a relatively untapped source of talent for leadership in the workplace. While progress has been made across the globe, barriers to women's advancement continue to exist, including cultural norms, stereotypes, and employer policies and practices.

The glass-ceiling barriers are evidenced worldwide, often compounded by cultural values and traditional gender roles and explained the differences in management/leadership styles between men and women. To illustrate, styles of management and leadership in the corporate world that are typically most valued are those often used by men (e.g., being direct and factual), rather than the interpersonal style women often use. Therefore, women who use the more direct communication style may be more likely to advance in the corporate world than women who do not. In summary; all these ideas show that glass ceiling is the visible and invisible obstacle which separates the professional and organizational hierarchical level for the women. In particular, women who believe that glass ceiling phenomenon will operate to their disadvantage may be less likely to apply for open positions than equally qualified men.

## References

- ALICIA E. KAUFMANN, Women in Management and Life Cycle –Aspects that Limit or Promote Getting to the Top – 2008
- BELGHITI- MAHUT S. et LANDRIEUX-KARTOCHIAN S. - GRH et genre - Les défis de l'égalité hommes-femmes, chapitre 6, Le plafond de verre, encore et toujours, Paris, Vuibert, 105-122. 2008
- BENDER A.F – PIGEYRE F. - GRH et genre – Les défis de l'égalité hommes-femmes, chapitre 5, Carrières des femmes entre opportunités, contraintes et choix, -Vuibert, 2008
- CATALYST, Staff, Successful Initiatives for Breaking the Glass Ceiling to Upward Mobility for Minorities and Women, United States Glass Ceiling Commission, 1993.
- COHEN, L. E., BROSHAK, J. P., & HAVEMAN, H. A. (1998). And then there were more? The effect of organizational sex composition on the hiring and promotion of managers. *American Sociological Review*, 63(5), 711–727.
- FEDERAL GLASS CEILING COMMISSION. (1995a). Good for business: Making full use of the nation's human capital. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.
- GRANT THORNTON INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS REPORT 2012, Women in senior management: still not enough, 2012
- HAIGH JO, Tales from the Glass Ceiling, a survival Guide for Women in Business, 2008
- HAR-EVEN E. Women and the Glass Ceiling in The American Workplace: Describing the Phenomenon and Its Internal and External Causes, The Manchester Review,
- HULTIN, MIA, 2003. "Some Take the Glass Escalator, Some Hit the Glass Ceiling? Career Consequences of Occupational Sex Segregation." *Work & Occupations*, 30 (1), 30–61.
- HYMOWITZ, C., & SCHELLHARDT, T. (1986, March 24). The corporate woman: A special report. *The Wall Street Journal*, Section 4, 1D–24D.
- KABASAKAL, H. "Women in Management Worldwide", Nisan 2004, Chapter 5, P. 273-293, Ashgate Publishing Company, www.ashgate.com
- KABASAKAL, H., BOYACIGILLER, N., and ERDEN, D. (1994), "Organizational Characteristics as Correlates of Women in Middle and Top Management" *Bogaziçi Journal: Review of Social, Economic, and Administrative Studies*, 8 (1-2).
- LAUFER Jacqueline, *La Revue Française de Gestion* : « Femmes et carrières : la question du plafond de verre », l'introduction de, 2004/4 no 151, p. 117-127. DOI : 10.3166/rfg.151.117-128
- LYNESS Karen S.- MADELINE E. Heilman, When Fit Is Fundamental: Performance Evaluations and Promotions of Upper-Level Female and Male Managers, *Journal of Applied Psychology* Copyright 2006 by the American Psychological Association 2006, Vol. 91, No. 4, 777–785
- MAUME, DAVID J. Jr. 2004. "Is the Glass Ceiling a Unique Form of Inequality? Evidence from a Random-Effects Model of Managerial Attainment." *Work & Occupations*, 31 (2), 250–274.
- POWELL, G. & BUTTERFIELD, G.N. (1979). The "good manager": Masculine or androgynous? *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 395-403.
- POWELL, D.A and G.N. BUTTERFIELD, (1994) "Investigating The 'Glass Ceiling' Phenomenon: An Empirical Study Of Actual Promotions To Top Management" *Academy Of Management Journal*; Vol:37, No:1;
- SCHENIDER Kenneth C. Schneider- JHONSON James C., McCCLURE Diane J., John Grey Believes Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus- *Business Forum* Vol.26, Nos.3,4
- SAKALLI-UGURLU, N., & BEYDOGAN, B. (2002). Turkish college students' attitudes toward women managers: The effect of patriarchy, sexism, and gender differences. *Journal of Psychology*, 136, 1-11.
- THE HARVARD BUSINESS REVIEW, 2008
- TURKISH STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, Women in Statistics 2011
- U.S. DEPARTEMENT of LABOR (2005). Employment and Earnings, 2005. Washington. DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics. <http://www.dol.gov/wb/>
- YAP M. and KONRAD A.M. Gender and Racial Differentials in Promotions: Is There a Sticky Floor, a Mid-Level Bottleneck, or a Glass Ceiling? *Département des relations industrielles, Université Laval*, 64-4, 2009, 593 – 619
- WIRTH, Linda (2001), *Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling: Women in Management*, International Labor Office, Geneva.